DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 689 HE 027 773

AUTHOR Fereshteh, M. Hussein
TITLE Higher Education Relations: Iranian and the United States Experience.
PUB DATE 28 Aug 94
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; College Students; Curriculum; *Educational History; Foreign Countries; *Higher Education; International Educational Exchange; International Relations; United States History
IDENTIFIERS *Iran; *Iranian Revolution 1979; Pahlavi University (Iran)

ABSTRACT

This review examined the views of 35 higher education professionals in order to explore the history of higher education relations between Iran and the United States particularly before and after the revolution in Iran. The study used interviews with participants, correspondence, and published material from journals, monographs, and newspapers. All participants, interviewees, and authors were either directly or indirectly involved with the Iranian university system before and after the revolution or were engaged in higher education relations involving Iranian and American institutions. The study found that relations between the two nations' higher education systems began in the late 1950s and that in the early 1960s direct and formal higher education relations started with fundamental changes at Shiraz (later Pahlavi) University aimed at making it a completely American-style university in Iran. These relations formally ceased in 1980 with the revolution. However, other relations continued and have taken the form of Iranian students, faculty, and other professionals in the United States who maintain personal and professional ties with Iran. Overall assessment finds that by 1978 Iran had 243 institutions of higher education with most of them at least superficially American-style and using curricula and materials imported from the United States. (Contains 36 end notes.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 375 689

HIGHER EDUCATION RELATIONS: IRANIAN and THE UNITED STATES EXPERIENCE

M. HUSSEIN FERESHTEH

HE 027 773

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Hussein Fereshteh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HIGHER EDUCATION RELATIONS: IRANIAN and THE UNITED STATES EXPERIENCE

The views and comments of thirty-five knowledgeable informants comprise the data base that has been utilized in this paper. The information was obtained by applying the oral history method in face to face interviews and telephone conversations. Correspondence, in the form of personal letters and questionnaire responses, has been used. Some of the data was also extracted from published documents such as journals, monographs, and newspapers written in English and Persian. The perspectives presented in this study concern the eras both just before and after the Revolution. The views of experts who were either directly or indirectly involved with the Iranian university system at these times, or were engaged in higher education relations involving Iranian and American institutions, will be interpreted. Some of the specialized informants who had been identified as possible sources of information for this inquiry unfortunately didn't want to be interviewed or respond to the questionnaire. Due to the importance of including some indication of what their perspectives on this matter have been, however, statements by them that were published since 1978 have been drawn upon. It seems that in some cases, although they didn't want to discuss this higher educational controversy with the researcher, they were not opposed to putting their views about it in print.

Some background concerning educational relations between Iran and the United States begins this exposition. This is followed by a discussion of perceptions regarding pre-1978 linkages among higher education institutions in Iran and America. Then our focus will shift to examining views of change that took place after 1978. We will also analyze the impact that the breaking off of the relations between Iran and the United States had on American private and public institutions of higher learning. However, the paper will conclude with presenting perspectives on some of the past and current problems and issues in Iranian higher education due to the Islamization of the system since 1980. Speculation about the future of Iranian-United States higher education relations will also be examined.

Early Stages of the Relations

American higher educators officially went to Iran in order to assist the Iranians to reform their universities and to open new ones in the late 1950's. They came after agreements had been reached between the governments of Iran and the United States. There had been unofficial educational relations between the two societies, however, for at least a century prior to this time. World War Two was an event that made many Americans much more aware of Iran and the Iranians than had previously been the case. American civilians and military personnel discovered where Iran is located, and learned about its political and strategic importance. Inversely, thousands of Iranians met their first Americans at this time, and got acquainted with American way of doing things.

IAE 027 773

It was during World War II that Americans found the opportunity to go to Iran and Iranians became interested in political and educational relations with the USA. Over 40,000 Iranians had worked with the American Military in moving supplies through Iran to Russia during World War II. Hundreds had worked with one or more of the three advisory groups employed by their government (Millspaugh, the Morrison and Knudson, Overseas Consultants) the United States Embassy, or the American Presbyterian Mission.1

On the basis that relations already had been formed and established by missionaries, private and U.S. government higher educational officials gradually became directly and indirectly involved in either establishing or reforming and reorganizing the Iranian institutions of higher education in the 1950's and 1960's. Most of the major Iranian universities were state-supported institutions or state-and private-supported institutions. "...Creating ties with U.S. institutions became common in Iran during the 1970's. Fifteen Iranian universities, for example, had a total of 42 formal links with 32 U.S. universities in late 1976."2

In the mean-time, many Iranian university faculty members, administrators and students were coming to U.S. institutions either for a short-term training or for studying. These bilateral higher education relations grew so rapidly that in early 1978, according to some specialists, the approximate numbers of Iranian students in the U.S. were between 60,000 to 75,000. In this regard, Labelle asserts that,

> ...in 1978, some 60,000 Iranian students were estimated to be studying under official government auspices in 40 countries. Forty percent of these individuals were studying in the United States where they constituted the largest non-U.S. citizen student population of any foreign country...3

Labelle is only talking about government-supervised students. There were many students, faculty members and administrators who came to the United States independently paying their own expenses and through personal connections with American universities. In the reverse case it is mentioned that over seventy major American universities with many faculty, advisors, administrators and technicians were in Iran forming new colleges and reforming the old ones.

During and after the Revolution of 1979 those vast higher education relations were discontinued, for several reasons. First, as soon as the Revolution started to form in early 1978, Americans began to leave Iran either by their own will or on the advice of the United States government. Second, the Revolution with its anti-western and in particular, anti-American contents made educational work impossible. Third, as soon as the first Islamic Republic government was elected, an order was issued to close the institutions of higher education for a fundamental Islamization of the higher education system. Fourth, the change

of the Iranian political system to an Islamic Republic made expatriate educators unwelcome.

The first official action which formed primary higher education relations between Iran and the United States was the mission of the Overseas Consultants Reports which presented some basic information about the capacity of the higher education system in Iran in 1949. The reports described the University of Tehran: "...the buildings were rated good, the equipment adequate, the professors well trained, and libraries, shops, and laboratories relatively much better than the schools of lower level."4

Another example of the early beginning of higher education relations with Iran is the educational voyage of Mr. G. P. Harnwell, President of the University of Pennsylvania during the 1950's. He was a member of the first group of American higher educators to go to Iran in order to assist in reforming its higher educational system:

> "Would you like to go to Iran?" said the secretary...The letter with which she capped the stack of correspondence awaiting my return from a winter holiday was from the International Cooperation Administration of our State Department. It inquired whether I would be free for an interval of a month or two in the not-too-distant future to participate in a brief survey to determine the feasibility of establishing a university of the American type in the ancient city of Shiraz (the fabled city of roses, wines, and caravans) lying within the south-central massif of Iran...it was clear that we would have little time for the general formulation of educational philosophy while bemused by exotic experiences and confused by discordant observation. In consequence, we set about the construction of a framework within which we hoped to be able to adapt our concept of the American pattern of higher education to whatever circumstances we encountered...they told us that "American Education" meant practical education to Iranians and that many of the present educational evils came from a weak central administration and the rigid autonomy of individual faculties. An educational community of able young men with a common focus and an emphasis on research could bring a fresh and stimulating atmosphere..... this presented some difficulty inasmuch as in the United States diversity is the rule among colleges and universities...5

Higher education relations and political relations are inter-connected, and they go hand in hand in the process of establishing relations between developed and developing nations. In Iran, "The Technical Assistance Program was born in politics and was weighted with politics throughout its two decades of existence."13. This actually was the first step in starting higher education relations with Iran. "Point Four," as it came to be called, became the precursor of many international and national assistance programs. The American effort became so well

Known as "Point Four" that not even the politics of later administrations could completely erase it. This was particularly true in Iran. There the Farsi translation, Asle Char, is still a password to friendly hospitality.6

During the late 1950's, a political technical assistance project strengthened the former relations between Iran and the U.S. "...Barely two months after President Harry S. Truman signed the Act for International Development on June 5, 1950, Dr. Franklin S. Harris was dispatched to negotiate an agreement to provide technical assistance to the government of Iran."7 These primary technical relations led and stronger higher education ties between Iran and the United States.

> Early in 1951 Director Harris negotiated a contract with the University of Utah, Utah State Agriculture College, and Brigham Young University under which these three institutions undertook to provide personnel in the fields of agriculture, education, health, and sanitation. In June 1951 three advisors recruited by the letter arrived in Tehran.8

By the early 1950's, therefore, higher education relations between Iran and the United State, channeled through official government agencies, were underway.

The Nature of the Higher Education Relations

Under the U.S. technical assistance Program (USAID), additional direct and formal higher education relations between the two countries started in the early 1960's with fundamental changes at Shiraz University, renamed Pahalavi University in 1962. The changes was aimed at its becoming a completely American-style university in Iran. The aims of this experiment were to , a) keep many well-qualified Iranian undergraduate and graduate students in Iran; and b) attract Iranian scholars in western countries, particularly in the U.S., to return to Iran and work for an Iranian university.

The beginning stages of higher education relations were not very complex and sophisticated but, as the relations advanced, other new sub-relations emerged within the framework of higher education and political links.

One American professor who visited Iran to observe the higher education linkage between the two nations in 1958 and 1978 explained that,

> Large numbers of Iranian educators and advanced students came to the United States for specialized training, sometimes for a few months, sometimes for much longer periods of time. American educators visited Iran, sometimes as consultants, sometimes on short-term appointments to teach their specializations. The Iranian military employed U.S. educators to teach military personnel English as well as specialized skills required for the operation and maintenance of sophisticated equipment of all sorts. Major U.S.

corporations contracted with the Iranian Air Force, other branches of army, and probably other ministries to train personnel in skills and specialized areas of knowledge essential to the performance of their official and /or military duties.9

Another university professor, analyzed some of the relations between his institution (University of Utah) and some other American institutions, with Iranian state and private universities. He asserts that,

> ...Major American universities established educational ties with the Universities of Tehran, Shiraz, Mashhad, etc., in the '60s and '70s. These included exchange of publications, students and faculty. In certain cases, specific programs at American institutions were funded either by the University of Tehran or by other categories: those with political strings attached, and others which were purely educational and cultural in nature.10

About bilateral higher education relations between the University of Tehran and the University of Utah he notes that,

> The University of Utah's agreement with the University of Tehran in 1975 fell under the second category. After ten years of a publication exchange program inaugurated in 1966, Utah and Tehran reached an agreement in 1975 for the annual exchange of four students: two Iranians in Computer Science, and two Americans in Humanities (Persian language, literature, history, etc.).11

Regarding some of the primary problems (caused by the relations) he comments that,

> The most notorious case of politically motivated relationships was established with the Iran government's grant of $3,000,000 to the University of Chicago in the early 1970s for establishment of the Pahlavi Center. The Center was never built and the University of Chicago was forced to return the total grant plus interest in the mid-1970s. Other examples were relations established by the granting of an Honorary Doctorate degree to the former Shah of Iran which had become a scandal by the late 1970s. It should be noted that Utah refused to grant any such degree, despite subtle pressures throughout the period during which we had educational ties with the University of Tehran.12

Concerning medical assistance from American private, and state agencies and institutions, his description is:

> The Medical School at the University of Tehran

needed assistance to give advanced training to its faculty, which Utah agreed to provide. In return, the University of Tehran agreed to provide an annual grant for the development of Iranian Studies at Utah's Middle Eastern Center. In the case of students, Tehran fully funded the two students we sent there. Under the agreements Utah paid all the expenses incurred in connection with the needs of Tehran's Medical School, and Tehran partially supported the program of Iranian Studies at the University of Utah which was established in 1960. From its beginning in 1960, financial support for the Middle East Center at the University of Utah has come from the Fulbright Program, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and a number of private U.S. foundations. The University of Tehran's financial contribution of $100,000 a year was provided for two academic years (1976-77, 1977-78). In 1975, the understanding was that we would be given two years notice in case Tehran decided to discontinue its support. We recruited new faculty and expanded a program on the basis of these assurances. The annual support was suspended in 1978 without notice, and the result was the termination of some faculty and continuation of others financed by the University of Utah.13

Another Iranian-U.S. relations specialist claims that Iranian and American higher education relations can be characterized in these words.

> 1) There was an expansion in the taking of Iranian studies in U.S. universities. As a result, American university students were increasingly exposed to Iranian culture; 2) The increasing number of Iranian students educated in the U.S. resulted in many of these students becoming critical of the Iranian education system; and those that returned to Iran and became professors tried to implement the American system, but without much success; and 3) I believe it was naive for many to think they could change over to the U.S. system of higher education, because this is something that is enforced by a few university professors. Instead, it has to come from the thinking of the population at large.14

On this background Professor Fischer, a knowledgeable scholar on Iranian culture and religion at Harvard, believes that U.S.-Iranian higher education relations had a great impact on the American institution.

> On the American side of course there also was the use of Iranian students' tuition to help with some American university financial needs. Many Iranians were

badly advised and foundered in American universities and institutions. But many more got educations that they could not have received at home. It would be interesting to document the ways in which Iranians were concentrated at certain universities, e.g. Kansas, Utah State, Louisiana; and how students of particular classes and/or ideological persuasions were concentrated at different universities; e.g., radical leftists at Boston State and Northeastern, while upper class conservatives at MIT and Harvard (with of course many individual exceptions).15

Regarding links between the U.S.-Iranian universities in 1970's Fischer asserts that,

> In the mid-seventies there were some twenty U.S. universities involved in bilateral deals with Iranian universities. The most interesting perhaps was the plan for Mazandaran University (Reza Shah Kabir University, originally) which was to be a graduate institution, aided in the initial stages only by Harvard--what was particularly interesting was the careful attempt to set up the university so that it would be independent of and protected from the influence of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, as well as the dual focus on the hard sciences and the social sciences. The model here was the very successful Iranian Center for Management Studies, set up on the model of , with the help of, and with staff from the Harvard Business School. A third interesting experiment was to be the Open University in England, but relying on satellite technology and having computer terminals for students in provincial towns. An interesting political goal of this particular experiment was to avoid having a concentration of potential activists--students disperse the students, have them work individually through terminals.16

Dr. Mehryar, who presently is a faculty member and administrator at Shiraz University, strongly believed that some of the higher educational relations have continued despite anti-U.S. political slogans.

> ...the fact that the Iranian government, despite political slogans, continues to send students and faculty to the USA and hold periodic trade shows for U.S. and British publishers to display their publications, is an indirect Anglo-American pattern. An attitude of acceptance and understanding on the part of U.S. universities will only encourage this trend.17

Amir Ajami, an Iranian Professor at the University of Arizona, has answered the question more generally than others. He

believes
that relations included:

> ...a focus on expansion of English at the university level; development of new fields of studies. Specific cooperative arrangements involved contracts between an Iranian university and a U.S. university; e.g., the University of Pennsylvania and Pahlavi University focusing on development of new fields, employment of American professors and use of American textbooks.18

A surprising answer came from the former president of Shiraz University, formerly Pahlavi University, during the first year of the Revolution. When he was asked, "What seems to you to be the nature of Iranian-United States higher education relations?" His response was : "Aren't you asking a wrong or irrelevant question? As far as I know all official relations between Iranian and American universities have ceased since 1980. So what could be the difference?"19

I received this answer while Dr. Mehryar was spending his sabbatical doing research for the University of Pennsylvania in the summer 1986. Also, when the matter of Iranian students still coming to the USA for advanced studies was discussed in an interview, he stated his belief that many Iranian students are still coming to the American universities.

Frank A. Stone, a Professor of international education who teaches Middle Eastern culture and education, described the nature of U.S.-Iranian relations saying that,

> ...a number of U.S. universities had contracts to collaborate in the development of new or reformed higher education programs in Iran. These involved supplying faculty and administrators to the partner institution there, so a good many Americans had part of their academic careers in Iran during this era. Also , many Iranian intellectuals were brought to the U.S. for advanced studies in order to fit them upon to return to leadership posts in the developing higher education sector of their home land.20

Stone also discusses some other forms of relations, mentioning that,

> ...textbooks were sent to Iran, sometimes used in English and sometimes adapted and translated into Farsi. Some of the American type of higher education management methods were adapted to Iran, such as having Boards of Trustees, making some provisions for limited "academic freedom" and having several types of funding for higher education. In the 1970's, also, it was notorious that economically shaky American colleges and universities sent recruiters to Tehran and major cities of Iran to sign up the youth from wealthy Iranian families who wished their children to obtain their

higher education overseas. In some cases the quality of these programs was questionable, and the organization AMIDEAST had an office in Tehran to screen applicants and American institutions to reduce the problems on both sides. Also, it was largely in the 1960's and 1970's that Iranian Studies programs were started in a number of American universities - in some cases staffed by Iranian scholars.21

Richard Bulliet, a professor of history at Columbia University, has an interesting point regarding the quality and nature of the relations.

> Iran was seeking rapid Americanization through inter-university linkages--such as Harvard-Reza Shah Kabir. The pace was fast and many American participants were opportunistic. Iran's effort lacked intellectual credibility in U.S. eyes.22

Michael C. Hillman, a scholar at the Center for Middle Eastern Studies at the University of Texas, summarizes higher education relations in several categories. He believes that the relations included, "...Exchange programs, American management and administration of Iranian universities, American textbooks, faculty and library systems."23

Mohammad Ali Izadi, a former college professor and Minister of Agriculture for one year under the Islamic Republic, now living Canada, believes that the Iran-U.S. higher education relations include:

> ...presently, Iranian students, some twenty-seven thousand living in the U.S.A.,normally have continuous relations with their family, friends as well as with the Iranian government official for some of their financial needs and paper work. One other kind of relation includes the Iranian professionals in the U.S.A. who are traveling to Iran on regularly basis. Also, many Iranian college professors and administrators who mostly are working for American universities are another basis to keep relations continuous. Telephone, radio, and correspondence communications and other kind of ways the relations between the countries alive.24

Mohammad Mashayekhi, a former professor of international and comparative education, history and philosophy of western and Iranian education, who for five years was president of Teachers' University of Tehran and presently is working for the U.N. in Geneva, had long-time involvement in inter-institutional relations between UCLA and Teachers' University of Tehran. He analyzed the kinds and qualities of Iran-United States relations.

> During 1960's and 70's the United States universities were as a Mecca for Iranian institutions of higher education to look into as an ideal model. Shiraz, with its new American-style university (Pahlavi

University), and known as a traditional Iranian city was become a show place for Iranian and American higher educators who did not pay attention to basic higher educational needs of the country. This carelessness created many new problems. For example, the graduates of Shiraz University emigrated to the United States and stayed there instead of staying with in the Iranian higher education system and working on some of the problems...and the students's expenses in the Shiraz University were triple, therefore many of its graduates found it less expensive and more prestigious to go to the American universities instead.25

Mashayekhi analyzes his experience with higher education relations between his university and the University of California,
Los Angeles from 1970 to 1979.

> The relations between Teachers University and the University of California Los Angeles were at an unsatisfactory level because: 1) the Iranian faculty members and administrators did not know English, they were mostly fluent in French and German. Therefore, they could not benefit from the knowledge of Americans in an advanced administrative level; and 2) the faculty and administrators who were sent to the University of California spent most of their time visiting and relaxing instead of studying and researching. On the other hand, we had lots of hope to use the present relation as the basis for a later more extended and developed one when we have moved to our new expanded building, the New Teachers University in Hsarak in 1985-1990. The New TU was planned to have ten thousand students. As a part of this project, we had already sent 200 of our honor-graduate students into the U.S. universities. But the project and plan stopped because all relations were cut in 1979.26

Mashayekhi believes that even though relations in some respects were not as healthy and effective as they were aimed to be, the potential for leading to healthier and more productive ones was there. Interestingly the views of Thomas J. Labelle, who was
involved in the Teachers' University and UCLA linkage are similar

to Mashayekhi's experiences and views. Labelle believes that,

> The UTE (University of Teachers Education, it is translated into Teachers' University of Tehran) -UCLA program can be viewed as an experiment in institutional collaboration across national and cultural boundaries. Since its inception, the Program endeavored to pursue a process of institution building at UTE that would enhance UTE's research, teaching and service capabilities while providing equivalent but distinct

benefits to UCLA's faculty and graduate students. Several factors, however, appeared to interfere with the achievement of this goal. The UTE's academic and professional mission seemed confused and contradictory. Such confusion often left both UTE and UCLA without clear direction in the collaborative program.27

Labelle's views on the nature of the relations at an institutional level are that,

> ...during the first four months of 1975, visits were made to each other's institutions by representatives of UTE, and UCLA and several overall goals were identified. These included graduate and postgraduate training for selected UTE fellowship students and faculty at UCLA; strengthening UTE'S institutional capacities in several disciplinary fields, but especially in research; the development of graduate level programs and ancillary activities associated with the building of UTE's new facilities outside Tehran at Hessarak-e Karaj; and opportunities for teaching and research participation for UCLA students and faculty both at UCLA and in Iran. It was projected that the nature and scope of such activities would require faculty exchange programs, degree and non-degree training at UCLA and UTE, collaborative research and development activities by students and faculty. Although it was thought from the beginning that UTE would probably be the greater beneficiary of such a relationship--the borrower-- discussions at UCLA clearly indicated that technical assistance--only exportation--was not the motivation underlying UCLA's involvement. Opportunities for UCLA were intended to offer faculty and students research involvement, participation in the development of an entirely new university, and experience in educational problem-solving within a different cultural context.28

Dr. Hakimeh Dabiran, the only woman holding university administrative position, educated in England, and presently the president of Al-Zahra (the name of the Prophet Mohammad's daughter) University, the only women's university of Iran, in an interview with Keyhan Newspaper mentioned that,

> The Iranian faculty members and students who are studying outside of Iran (mostly are either teaching or studying in the U.S.A. universities) should chose their research subject related to Iranian educational and social problems. Those who do so we will support and help. So far, some of them have undertaken some research in connection to the problem of this university and we have helped them. We need these peoples' knowledge, experiences and expertise. Those who are willing to come back and serve their country, our government should provide the possibilities and

some of their basic needs.29

Farhang Mehryar, former President of Shiraz University and the Head of the Department of Educational Research and Evaluation, is spending sabbatical time at the University of Pennsylvania working on a research project. He believes that higher educational relations between Iran and the U.S. began with,

> A change from the European model to American in terms of arrangement of courses into semester-units, increased use of English textbooks; emphasis on research of an internationally presentable quality as a major function of the faculty; sending more students to the U.S.A., bilateral agreements with U.S. institutions. Major relations included curriculum content, organizational and administrative ones. Some of the relations remain to be continued through the faculty sabbaticals which practically favors those coming to the U.S.A., and through the central planning committees within the Supreme Council for Cultural Revolution whose expert members are mostly American trained.30

Habib Ladjvardi, a former founder of the Iranian Center for Management, an institution which used technical and administrative assistance from Harvard's School of Business, is now the Executive Secretary of the Society for Iranian Studies and the Director of Iranian Oral History Program at Harvard. He believes the nature of U.S.-Iranian higher education relations included mostly the "...Use of curriculum and teachers in Iran; training of Iranian faculty in the U.S.A.; Pahlavi-Penn was a prime example."31

Fatola Samiy, an Iranian professor in Washington D.C., sees the relations in a more political context rather than a higher educational one. He claims that,

> ...historical background tells us that the Persians were afraid of Russia and hated Britain for centuries, and their tendency toward Germany during the 1930's and the first part of the last World War was merely to kill two enemies by one and take their vengeance. So, when the war ended, principally by American might, and left the United States as the sole superpower in the globe, Persian moved toward America. Since the flock of Persian youngsters entered into American higher institutions, their annual return home since the 1940s' and 1950s', as well as the establishment of the Point Four, should be considered the era of American cultural and educational influence in Persia. The return of over 200,000 educated Persians within three decades, and their occupation in key administrative positions and private sector of the country caused a great change in the Persian system of education as well as the style of living.32

M. R. Ghanoonparvar, another Iranian professor at the University of Virginia, contends that higher education relations between the two countries did more harm to Iran rather than benefitting our society.

> ...one area of major relations in higher education was training of large numbers of university professors in the U.S., unfortunately, among these professors those who spent a long period of time in the U.S. and understood the system were incapable of implementing their ideas in Iran and others only acquired a very superficial understanding of the U.S. educational system and upon their return did more harm than good.33

Mohammad Estelami, a former professor of modern literature as well as at one time have been administrator of the Teachers' University of Tehran, presently is a researcher at the Center for Documents and Information Middle Eastern Studies at Pennsylvania. He claims that most of our higher educational relations were inter-related into our economic and political ties with the United States. Here are his words:

> The nature of the higher education relations depended on economical and political relations with the U.S.A. This relation started to expand right after 1953 (the year of the fall of Dr. Mosadeq and return of the Shah). The relations began with giving financial support and technical assistance to the Iranian institutions of higher education by U.S. government and higher educational officials. This was followed with the invitation of American faculty members and advisors, exchange of human resources and making contracts for the reformation and expansion of our universities with the overseeing positions of the Americans. In many cases these relations were unnecessary, and in some other cases were advantageous, but I think Iranians paid a very higher price for the whole process of higher education relations and they did not gain as much as they were supposed to...33

Ahmad Ashraf, an Iranian-American professor of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University, does not think that the Iranian institutions of higher education had relations only with French, German, and American universities. Some major Iranian universities were also strongly effected by Italian higher education curriculum and thought. Here is his opinion.

> I should mention that the Iranian higher education fundamentally was not only related and influenced by the French (the first half of the 19 century to 1960) and the U.S. (from 1960 to present), and England and Germany did not have much relation and influence unless in some areas such as technical and vocational education. Obviously, Italy was the most influential one, particularly on civil engineering and city

architecture; National University and Tehran University educated many Iranian engineers in those areas.34

The major relations and influences have also been analyzed by Professor Ahmad Mehrdad, an educational specialist living in West Germany.

> Certainly the relations include; the presence of Iranian students in the U.S., the hidden or secret economic relations, some Iranians studies department or programs which are still functioning, even though they are not supported by the U.S. Government, some major business relations which have taken place among Iran-Americans or by some other middle parties or by some Iranian researchers and professors in American universities. I believe this apparently breaking off relations of higher education is very similar to the one which took place between Iran and Germany in 1941. 35

Abdol Hossein Sammiy, former Minister of Science and Higher Education, an M.D. from American universities, presently practicing in New York City, believes that the majority of Iranian students
outside of Iran were studying in the U.S. universities.

> ...there are about 60,000 Iranian students scattered throughout forty countries. (An additional number of students have gone overseas through other than official government channels.) Of this total, 40 percent are studying in the United States, 26 percent in England, 9 percent in France. The remaining 17 percent are scattered in thirty-six other countries. The United States has been attracting an increasingly higher proportion of Iranian students. Their areas of subject-field concentration of the foreign-education students who have returned are technological medicine--10 percent; administration and economics--17 percent; medicine--10 percent; experimental science--9 percent; art--7 percent; and all others--17 percent. 36

The higher education linkages between Iran and the United States between 1960 and 1987 were evaluated in this paper. It included the perceptions of qualified specialist informants regarding the various impacts on both societies within the domain of higher education were investigated. The evidence that was compiled made it clear that since 1960 higher education policies, programs, and practices in Iran had important influences on the economic, political, religious, and social aspects of the country. As the informants understand the situation, the reverse is also undoubtedly true.

As seen by informants who contributed to this investigation, there were both positive and negative aspects of these Iranian-American higher education relations. The negative results, of course, presumably were not anticipated. In many cases, the

projected positive outcomes were never quite realized. Nevertheless, a new and modern system of higher educating was formed in Iran during the period of rapid growth in Iran which took place in the late 1960's and 1970's. As a result, Iran had 243 institutions of higher learning in 1978. Most of them were at least superficially American-style, utilizing curriculum materials imported from the United States. They often had American advisors, employed some American instructional technology, and sometimes even used English as the teaching language. Among the outcomes of these developments that were usually considered to be negative by the informants was the considerable "brain drain" of Iranian intellectuals and professionals that was caused. The American type institutions required preparing Iranian academicians in the United States who were supposed to come back to staff the growing higher educational sector of their homeland. Unfortunately, for variety of reasons, the scenario didn't always happen, and many of Iran's best educated and brightest young scholars were lost to the country.

According to the perceptions of many informants, higher education relations between a less economically advanced country like Iran and a technologically sophisticated on such as the United States are uneven. Thus, they believe that in many aspects, the involvements were rather one-sided. Their analyses conclude that the more powerful society penetrates the culture of the less powerful one to a much greater extant than is inversely the case. They therefore describe the many American higher education influences that caused a vast and very rapid development of the system of higher learning in Iran. They do not emphasize the inverse dynamics in which American universities were being affected by their Iranian connections.

There was, however, recognition that the modern western type of learning was being infused into the traditional Islamic system of higher learning in Iran prior to the Revolution. There the new disciplines and instructional methods met with great resistance. Thus a major sector of higher education in Iran remained distant from the innovations taking place in the universities. Not only were the academic changes not adopted uniformly across the spectrum of Iranian higher learning, but particularly the madrasah teachers and their students, and the considerable constituency of their supporters, were hostile to the changes. This was a profound ideological confrontation in which the Iranians who adopted the American approaches were regarded as atheists and materialists. From the perspective of Shiite Islamic clerics, they had turned their backs on Iran's Muslim heritage.

However, Iranian higher education is today facing many problems. Most of the informants claimed that the problem of double-standard management, multi-policy making centers, and the shortages of faculty members are three fundamental ones. The opinion of the opposing group is that any higher education system in the formative stages, experiencing new ideas, trying to stand on its own feet while terminating the old system would be facing the same dilemmas. As a matter of fact, many old problems and issues in the American higher education system are still there. The conflict goes on but so does the American higher education

system. Gradually the system in Iran, it is argued, will find its own solutions to their unique problems of higher education. Since this study concerned bilateral higher education relations between two culturally unique nations, it is necessary to make two different recommendations for each society. Three recommendations concerning American higher education in relation to the Iranian university system are as follows:

1. Maintain and expand Iranian Studies programs at American Universities only to the extent that qualified American or Iranian scholars are available to staff them.

2. Develop adequate sources of funding for Iranian Studies in the United States from official government, philanthropic foundations, and corporate and private donors using the rationale that it is of vital national importance that more Americans learn Persian and have greater knowledge of Iranian culture, history, and current affairs.

3. Negotiate new agreements with the present higher educational authorities in the Islamic Republic of Iran to make it easier for some Iranian academicians to come to the United States for scholarly research purposes, and for carefully selected graduate students to study specialized fields at American universities.

The recommendations concerning Iranian higher education problems and the relations with United States are as follows:

1. Create American studies programs in major universities, in order to establish this discipline within Iranian learning and to increase understanding of the American cultural, education, political and economic systems.

2. Encourage highly qualified graduate and post-graduate students to go to the educationally prestigious institutions of higher educations in different technologically developed nations, so that Iran can benefit from advanced areas of science, and the technological experience of these nations.

3. Invite American scholars to visit Iran and utilize them not only to solve the problems that are directly related to the blindly adaptation of western European and American higher educational system for the past century, but also to bring new teaching and administrative techniques through people rather than books and magazines.

4. A strong united policy making system should be created, in order to prevent conflict among university administrators.

Notes

1. Thomas J. Labelle, "Inter-Institutional Cooperation: A Case Study of UCLA (U.S.) and UTE (Iran), VCCA Education, vol. 22,
No. 1, Winter 1984, p. 63.

2. Ibid., p. 62.

3. Overseas Consultants, Inc., Seven Year Development Plan for the Plan Organization of the Imperial Government of Iran, Vol. II, (New York: Overseas Consultant, Inc. 1949), p. 83.

4. Gaylord P. Harnwell, Educational Voyaging in Iran, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962, pp. 1-26.

5. Handershot, P. xiii.

6. Ibid., p. Xiii.

7. Ibid., p. 13.

8. Donald N. Wilber. Iran: Past and Present, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965, p. 207-208.

9. Questionnaire # 22, a Professor of Middle Eastern and African Studies, Ohio University.

10. Questionnaire # 23, a Professor of Middle Eastern Studies.

11. Ibid., 1986.

12. Ibid., 1986.

13. Ibid., 1986.

14. Questionnaire # 17, Hossein Askari, Professor of Iranian Studies at George Washington University, 1986.

15. Questionnaire # 2, Michael. M. J. Fischer, a Harvard University Professor, who visited Iran before and after The Revolution, 1986.

16. Ibid., 1986.

17. Ibid., 1986.

18. Questionnaire # 3, Amir Ajami, Professor of Iranian Studies at the University of Arizona, 1985.

19. Personal Interview with Dr. Farhang Mehryar, a professor from Pahlavi University, presently spending his sabbatical doing research for the University of Pennsylvania, 1986.

20. Questionnaire # 5, Dr. Frank A. Stone, Professor of International Education, The University of Connecticut, Stoors.

21. Dr. Richard Bulliet, Professor of History, Columbia University, New York.

22. Michael C. Hillman a scholar at the Center for Middle Eastern Studies at the University of Texas, 1986.

23. Dr. Mohammad Ali Izadi, a Former College professor under the Shah's government and Minister of Agriculture for one year under the Islamic Republic, living in Canada, 1986.

24. Dr. Mohammad Mashayekhi, a former professor of international education, history and philosophy of western and Iranian education, former president of Teachers University of Tehran, presently working for U.N. in Geneva, 1986.

25. Ibid.

26. Dr. Thomas J. Labelle, former Professor of Education at UCLA (He is now Dean of the School of Education at the University of Pittsburgh, PA) was involved in the Teachers University and UCLA cooperation. p. 65, 1986.

27. Dr. Thomas J. Labelle, p. 63.

28. Dr. Hakimeh Dabiran, presently president of Al-Zahra University, the only women's university of Iran, she was interviewed by a reporter from Kyhan Havaii Newspaper, No 680. p. 21, June 25, 1986.

29. Dr. Farhang Mehryar, former President of Shiraz University and the Head of the Department of Educational Research and Evaluation, 1986.

30. Professor Habib Ladjvardi, a former founder of the Iranian Center for Management, presently, the Executive Secretary of the Society for Iranian Studies and Director of Iranian Oral History Program at Harvard, 1985.

31. Dr. Fatola Samiy an Iranian professor in Washington D. C., 1986.

32. Dr. M. R. Ghanoonparvar, professor of Language and Culture at the University of Virginia, 1985.

33. Dr. Mohammad Estelami, a former professor of Modern Persian Literature and as well as administrator at the Teachers' University of Tehran, who presently is a researcher at Center for Documents and Information of Middle Eastern Studies at Pennsylvania, 1986.

34. Dr. Ahmad Ashraf, an Iranian-American professor of Near

Eastern Studies at Princeton University, 1986.

35. Professor Ahmad Mehrdad, an educational specialist living in Frankfurt, West Germany, 1986.

36. Dr. Abdol Hossein Samii, Systems of Higher Education: Iran, New York, New York: Interbook Inc, 1978, p.